JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

#### CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Linda Liano		DEFENDANTS Computer Science	es Corporation, Inc.	
(b) County of Residence o	f First Listed Plaintiff <u>Chester</u> XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		of First Listed Defendant  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES C  DNDEMNATION CASES, USE T  OF LAND INVOLVED.	
Rahul Munshi, Esquire, (	Address, and Telephone Number) Console Law Offices LLC Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19102 consolelaw.com	Attorneys (If Known)		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		TF <b>DEF</b> 1 ① 1 Incorporated <i>or</i> Pr of Business In T	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2	
		Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT				
CONTRACT  110 Insurance	TORTS PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	□ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Pharmaceutical	of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)  153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits  190 Other Contract  195 Contract Product Liability  196 Franchise	□ 340 Marine Injury Product Liability Liability PERSONAL PROPE □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ 370 Other Personal □ 7 1 Truth in Lending □ 360 Other Personal □ 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	LABOR  Capta	SOCIAL SECURITY    861 HIA (1395ff)   862 Black Lung (923)   863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))   864 SSID Title XVI'   865 RSI (405(g))	□ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Seourities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration
REAL PROPERTY  210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO  440 Other Civil Rights  441 Voting Habeas Corpus:  442 Employment  443 Housing/ Accommodations  PRISONER PETITIO  463 Alien Detaince  510 Motions to Vacat Sentence  530 General	791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS  870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)  871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 535 Death Penalty	Actions		
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in X" 1 Original 2 Rer Proceeding Star	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	☐ 4 Reinstated or ☐ 5 Transfe Reopened Another	rred from	ct
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a 42 U.S.C. §2000e, et seq. ("Title VIBrief description of cause: Plaintiff was discriminated against b	are filing <i>(Do not cite jurisdictional state</i> 1"), 29 U.S.C. §621, et seq. ('	utes unless diversity): "ADEA"), 43 P.S. §951,	et seq. ("PHRA").
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION		CHECK YES only i JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):  JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 03/08/201 <del>6</del>	The state of the s	TORNEY OF RECORD		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	, and			
	OUNT ADDIVING IED	MDGE	MAG IIID	OF.

### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Linda Liano	:	CIVIL ACTION	
V.	aintiff		
Computer Sciences		NO.	
n accordance with the Civolaintiff shall complete a Ciling the complaint and servide of this form.) In the designation, that defendant he plaintiff and all other parts.	ase Management Track Designate a copy on all defendants. (See event that a defendant does not shall, with its first appearance,	Reduction Plan of this court, counsel attion Form in all civil cases at the time e § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse agree with the plaintiff regarding says submit to the clerk of court and serve ek Designation Form specifying the traced.	of rse aid on
SELECT ONE OF THE F	OLLOWING CASE MANAG	SEMENT TRACKS:	
a) Habeas Corpus – Cases	brought under 28 U.S.C. § 224	1 through § 2255. (	)
(b) Social Security – Cases and Human Services de	requesting review of a decision nying plaintiff Social Security	n of the Secretary of Health Benefits. (	)
c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.			)
(d) Asbestos – Cases involence (d. )	ving claims for personal injury	or property damage from (	)
commonly referred to a	Cases that do not fall into track s complex and that need special side of this form for a detailed	l or intense management by explanation of special	)
(f) Standard Management	- Cases that do not fall into any	one of the other tracks. (	X)
March 8, 2016	// Delle	Linda Liano, Plainiff	
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for Plaintiff	
215-545-7676	215-814-8920	munshi@consolelaw.com	
<u>Felephone</u>	FAX Number	E-Mail Address	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

#### Case 2:16-cv-01080-HB Document 1 Filed 03/08/16 Page 3 of 21

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Defendant: 1160 West Swedesford Road, Berwyn,	
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 1160 West Swedesford Roa (Use Reverse Side For	
· ·	
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a	
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed. Accord	"
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No <b>™</b>
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:         Judge	Date Terminated:
ase Number;Judge	Date Terminated.
civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one	year previously terminated action in this court?
	Yes□ No□ <b>X</b>
. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior	suit pending or within one year previously terminated
action in this court?	Yes□ No <b>™</b>
Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier	
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ Not
. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rigi	hts case filed by the same individual?
. Is this case a second of successive naceds corpus, section second, appears, or pro-section is	Yes□ No <b>X</b>
IVIL: (Place 🗸 in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
I. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA	2.   Airplane Personal Injury
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. Assault, Defamation
4. 🗆 Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury
5. D Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. 🗗 Civil Rights	7.   Products Liability
3.   Habeas Corpus	8.   Products Liability — Asbestos
9.  Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
0. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
1.   All other Federal Question Cases	
(Please specify)	
ARBITRATION CER	
Rahul Munshi , counsel of record do hereby cert	
□ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and	
150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
DATE: March 8, 2016	307548
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	nere has been compliance with F.K.C.P. 38.
certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending o	r within one year previously terminated action in this court
xcept as noted above.	
DATE: March 8, 2016	307548

Attorney-at-Law

Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

LINDA LIANO BERWYN, PA 19312

CIVIL ACTION NO.

Plaintiff.

٧.

COMPUTER SCIENCES CORPORATION, INC. 1160 WEST SWEDESFORD ROAD BERWYN, PA 19312

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Defendant.

#### **CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT**

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Linda Liano ("Plaintiff") brings this action against her former employer, Defendant Computer Sciences Corporation, Inc. ("Defendant"). Plaintiff, a long-time, high performing employee of Defendant, was terminated on December 12, 2012 due to her sex and age. Defendant, whose Executive Leadership and Board of Directors consists entirely of men, engaged in a scheme through an illegal "restructuring" process to decrease the number of older and/or female workers in the company while retaining and promoting younger and/or male workers.

Plaintiff, an older female, was discriminated against because of her sex and age in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §2000e, et seq. ("Title VII"), the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, as amended, 29 U.S.C.

§621, et seq. ("ADEA"), and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, as amended, 43 P.S. §951, et seq. ("PHRA"). Plaintiff seeks damages, including back-pay, front-pay, compensatory, punitive, liquidated, costs and attorneys' fees, and all other relief that this Court deems appropriate.

#### II. PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff, Linda Liano, is an individual and a citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. She resides in Berwyn, Pennsylvania.
- 2. Plaintiff was a fifty-nine (59) year old female at the time Defendant terminated her employment on December 12, 2012. She is currently sixty-two (62) years old.
- 3. Defendant Computer Sciences Corporation, Inc. is a Nevada corporation with a principal place of business located at 1160 West Swedesford Road, Berwyn, PA 19312.
- 4. Defendant is engaged in an industry affecting interstate commerce and, at all relevant times, has regularly conducted business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 5. At all times material hereto, Defendant has acted as an "employer" within the meaning of the statutes which form the basis of this matter.
- 6. At all times material hereto, Defendant employed more than twenty (20) individuals.
- 7. At all times material hereto, Defendant acted by and through its authorized agents, servants, workmen, and/or employees acting within the course and scope of their employment with Defendant and in furtherance of Defendant's business.

8. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was an "employee" of Defendant within the meaning of the statutes which form the basis of this matter.

#### III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 9. The causes of action which form the basis of this matter arise under the ADEA, Title VII and the PHRA.
- 10. The District Court has jurisdiction over Count I (ADEA) pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §626(c) and 28 U.S.C. §1331.
- 11. The District Court has jurisdiction over Count II (Title VII) pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5 and 28 U.S.C. §1331.
- 12. The District Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Count III (PHRA) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.
- 13. Venue is proper in the District Court under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred within this District.
- 14. On or about May 2, 2013, Plaintiff filed a Charge of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"), complaining of the acts of discrimination alleged herein ("Charge"). Attached hereto, incorporated herein, and marked as Exhibit "A" is a true and correct copy of the EEOC Charge of Discrimination (with personal identifying information redacted).
- 15. On or about December 10, 2015, the EEOC issued to Plaintiff a Notice of Right to Sue. Attached hereto, incorporated herein, and marked as Exhibit "B" is a true and correct copy of this notice (with minor redactions for purposes of electronic filing of confidential/identifying information).

16. Plaintiff has fully complied with all administrative prerequisites for the commencement of this action.

#### IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 17. In or about May 1997, Plaintiff was hired by Defendant as a Consultant.
- 18. Plaintiff remained employed by Defendant until December 12, 2012, the date of her unlawful termination of employment.
- 19. Plaintiff consistently performed her job duties for Defendant in a satisfactory manner and she received several promotions throughout her tenure with Defendant.
- 20. Plaintiff received numerous bonuses, salary increases, and stock option grants during her employment with Defendant.
- 21. From around 1997 until 2012, Plaintiff consistently received positive performance reviews where she was ranked as either "met" or "exceeded" expectations.
  - 22. Plaintiff's last position with Defendant was Operations Director.
- 23. Upon becoming an Operations Director, in or about 2010, Plaintiff reported to Mark Roman (56, male), President of the Global Health Care Operations.
- 24. Roman reported to Jim Cook (57, male), President of Business Solutions and Services Sector.
- 25. Defendant permits a culture of allowing male supervisors to make gender based remarks about female employees without punishment.
- 26. For example, in or about October 2010, Roman began making inappropriate comments about Plaintiff. Roman called Plaintiff "hot" and "pleasing to the eyes" to Benjamin Petitti (29, male), Plaintiff's direct report.

- 27. In or about November 2010, Plaintiff complained to Becca Snook (late 40s, female), Global Human Resources Business Partner, about Roman's inappropriate behavior and told Snook that Roman made her feel uncomfortable.
- 28. Snook told Plaintiff to view Roman's comments as "harmless" and instructed her not to pursue any formal actions.
  - 29. Defendant failed to investigate Plaintiff's complaints.
- 30. In early 2012, Michael Lawrie, Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer, announced that Defendant was going to conduct a structural reorganization.
- 31. During this structural reorganization, Defendant eliminated several positions, including Plaintiff's.
- 32. At the same time, Defendant created numerous new positions within the new organizational model.
- 33. Defendant never considered Plaintiff for these newly created positions, even though she was qualified for many of these jobs.
- 34. Rather, Defendant placed younger and/or male employees who were less qualified than Plaintiff into these positions.
- 35. Defendant engaged in a pattern and practice of retaining younger and/or male employees to be reassigned to new positions in lieu of termination.
- 36. By way of example only, the following individuals, each of whom **reported to Plaintiff**, were not terminated and were placed into newly created positons for which Plaintiff was qualified:
  - a. Brandy Baxter (31, female);
  - b. Heather Graninger (32, female);

- c. Nicholas Northam (36, male); and
- d. Benjamin Petitti (29, male).
- 37. Defendant placed employees, including Plaintiff, whose positions were eliminated, but who were not placed into one of the numerous new positions, into a "Talent Pool."
- 38. Employees who were placed into the "Talent Pool" were supposed to be placed in other positions at Defendant.
- 39. However, instead of retaining the employees in the "Talent Pool," Defendant terminated the entire "Talent Pool."
- 40. Consequently, on or around December 12, 2012, Plaintiff received a termination letter from Defendant.
  - 41. Plaintiff's performance played no role in the decision to terminate her.
- 42. Defendant engaged in a pattern and practice of discriminating against older women by terminating their employment and failing to place them in positions for which they were more qualified than their younger and/or male colleagues.
- 43. By way of example, Defendant terminated Anne Roeser (58, female), Client Relationship Executive in the Health Care Group and failed to place her in a new position for which she was qualified, while Defendant placed younger and/or male employees in these positions.
- 44. Further, Defendant terminated Dawna Lisa Ragusa (59, female), Director of Marketing and Communications, and failed to place her in a new position for which she was qualified, while Defendant placed younger and/or male employees in these positions.

- 45. Upon knowledge and belief, Defendant has a corporate culture of bias in favor of males.
- 46. By way of example, at the time of Plaintiff's termination the leadership of Defendant was primarily male:
  - a. for the top three highest job levels, seventy (70%) percent were male;
  - b. all of the eleven (11) Executive Leadership employees were male;
  - c. all of the eleven (11) Operational Executive Officers were male; and
  - d. all of the nine (9) members of the Board of Directors were male.
- 47. Plaintiff's age (59) was a substantial, motivating, and/or determinative factor in the decision to terminate her employment.
- 48. Plaintiff's sex (female) was a substantial, motivating, and/or determinative factor in the decision to terminate her employment.
- 49. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's behavior, Plaintiff has sustained in the past and will sustain in the future a loss of earning, emotional upset, and pain and suffering.
- 50. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages as a result of the unlawful behavior complained of herein unless and until this Court grants the relief requested herein.
- 51. The conduct of Defendant, as set forth above, was outrageous under the circumstances, was done by and with knowledge of upper management, and warrants the imposition of punitive damages against Defendant.

#### COUNT I - ADEA

52. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraph 1 through 51 above,

as if set forth herein in their entirety.

- 53. Plaintiff's age was a substantial, motivating, and/or determinative factor in connection with Defendant's treatment of her.
- 54. By committing the foregoing acts of discrimination against Plaintiff, Defendant has violated the ADEA.
- 55. Said violations were willful and warrant the imposition of liquidated damages.
- 56. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the ADEA, Plaintiff has suffered the damages and losses set forth herein and has incurred attorneys' fees and costs.
- 57. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages as a result of Defendant's discriminatory and retaliatory acts unless and until this Court grants the relief requested herein.
  - 58. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.

#### **COUNT II – TITLE VII**

- 59. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraph 1 through 58 above, as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 60. Plaintiff's sex was a substantial, motivating, and/or determinative factor in connection with Defendant's treatment of her.
- 61. By committing the foregoing acts of discrimination against Plaintiff, Defendant has violated Title VII.
- 62. Said violations were willful and intentional and warrant the imposition of punitive damages.

- 63. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of Title VII, Plaintiff has suffered the damages and losses set forth herein and has incurred attorneys' fees and costs.
- 64. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages as a result of Defendant's discriminatory acts unless and until this Court grants the relief requested herein.
  - 65. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.

#### **COUNT III - PHRA**

- 66. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 65 above, as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 67. Plaintiff's age was a substantial, motivating, and/or determinative factor in connection with Defendant's treatment of Plaintiff.
- 68. Plaintiff's sex was a substantial, motivating, and/or determinative factor in connection with Defendant's treatment of Plaintiff.
- 69. By committing the foregoing acts of discrimination Defendant has violated the PHRA.
- 70. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the PHRA, Plaintiff has sustained the injuries, damages, and losses set forth herein and has incurred attorneys' fees and costs.
- 71. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages as a result of Defendant's discriminatory acts unless and until this Court grants the relief requested herein.
  - 72. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.

9

#### **RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendant by:

- a. declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be a violation of the ADEA;
- b. declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be a violation of the Title VII;
- c. declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of the PHRA;
  - d. enjoining and restraining permanently the violations alleged herein;
  - e. awarding Plaintiff back-pay;
  - f. awarding Plaintiff front-pay;
- g. awarding compensatory damages to Plaintiff for past and future emotional upset and pain and suffering;
  - h. awarding liquidated damages;
  - i. awarding punitive damages;
- j. awarding Plaintiff the costs of this action, together with reasonable attorneys' fees;
- k. awarding Plaintiff such other damages as are appropriate under the, ADEA, Title VII, and PHRA; and

I. granting such other and further relief as this Court deems appropriate.

**CONSOLE LAW OFFICES LLC** 

Date: March 8, 2016 By:

STEPHEN G. CONSOLE

RAHUL MUNSHI ASHLEY N. WARING

1525 Locust Street, Ninth Floor

Philadelphia, PA 19102

(215) 545-7676

(856) 545-8211 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiff, Linda Liano

# **EXHIBIT** A

	CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION			CHARGE NUMBER	
This form is affected by the Privacy Act of 19 consolidating this form.	nent before	X EEO			
STATE OR LOCAL AGENC	Y: PHRC				
NAME (Indicate Mr., Ms., Mrs.)		HOME TELE	PHONE N	JMBER (Include Area Code)	
Linda Liano					
	ITY, STATE AND ZI Berwyn, PA 19312	P		DATE OF BIRTH	
NAMED IS THE EMPLOYER, LABOR ( STATE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT WHO	ORGANIZATION, E	MPLOYMEN GAINST ME	T AGENC	Y, APPRENTICESHIP, COMMITTED an one than list below)	
NAME	NUMBER OF EMP	LOYEES	TEI	EPHONE (Include Area Code)	
Computer Sciences Corporation	> 1000			876-1000	
STREET ADDRESS	CITY, STATE AN	D ZIP		COUNTY	
1160 West Swedesford Road	Berwyn, PA 1931	2		Chester <sup>§</sup>	
HQ: 3170 Fairview Park Drive	Falls Church, VA	22042			
	ropriate box(es)) ational Origin her (Specify)		DATE DISC Earliest:	CRIMINATION TOOK PLACE  Latest 12/12/12	
THE PARTICULARS ARE: A. 1. Relevant Work History					
+	ciences Corporat approximately 199 vas promoted to F at time, I started	98, I was p Partner and reporting t	romoted d in 2010 o Mark F	, my role was relabeled and I Roman, Group President (male	
I was hired by Computer Solife Sciences practice in 1997. In a life Sciences practice. In 2004, I work occame Operations Director. At the 54*), who was my supervisor at the All ages herein are approximate.	ciences Corporat approximately 199 vas promoted to F at time, I started e time of my term	98, I was partner and reporting tination. Mr	oromoted d in 2010 o Mark F r. Roman	to Operations Manager for the , my role was relabeled and I doman, Group President (male reported to Jim Cook (male).	
I was hired by Computer Solife Sciences practice in 1997. In a Life Sciences practice. In 2004, I work occame Operations Director. At the 54*), who was my supervisor at the All ages herein are approximate.  I want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the agencies if I change my additional to the second se	ciences Corporat approximately 199 vas promoted to F eat time, I started the time of my termi	98, I was partner and reporting to ination. Mu	oromoted d in 2010 to Mark F r. Roman	to Operations Manager for the my role was relabeled and I doman, Group President (male reported to Jim Cook (male).	
I was hired by Computer Solife Sciences practice in 1997. In a life Sciences practice. In 2004, I work operations Director. At the 54*), who was my supervisor at the All ages herein are approximate.	ciences Corporat approximately 199 vas promoted to F eat time, I started the time of my termi	98, I was per and reporting to ination. Mu	oromoted in 2010 to Mark For Roman  - (when necessaffirm that I	to Operations Manager for the my role was relabeled and I doman, Group President (male reported to Jim Cook (male).  Descriptions of the manager for the my role was relabeled and I doman, Group President (male).	
I was hired by Computer Solife Sciences practice in 1997. In a Life Sciences practice. In 2004, I work became Operations Director. At the 54*), who was my supervisor at the FAII ages herein are approximate.  If I want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the Fany. I will advise the agencies if I change my add and cooperate fully with them in the processing of metals.	ciences Corporat approximately 199 vas promoted to F at time, I started the time of my termi	98, I was per and reporting to ination. Mu	oromoted in 2010 to Mark For Roman  - (when necessaffirm that I	to Operations Manager for the my role was relabeled and I doman, Group President (male reported to Jim Cook (male).  Description of the manager for the my role was relabeled and I doman, Group President (male).  Description of the manager for the my role was relabeled and Local Requirements).  Description of the my role was related to the manager for the my role was related to the my role was rel	
I was hired by Computer Solife Sciences practice in 1997. In a life Sciences practice. In 2004, I work operations Director. At the pecame Operations Director. At the 54*), who was my supervisor at the fall ages herein are approximate.  If I want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the fany. I will advise the agencies if I change my add and cooperate fully with them in the processing of north their procedures	ciences Corporat approximately 199 vas promoted to F at time, I started the State or local Agency dress or telephone numbe my charge in accordance	98, I was per and reporting to ination. Mu	oromoted in 2010 o Mark For Roman  - (when necessaffirm that I of my know	to Operations Manager for the my role was relabeled and I coman, Group President (male reported to Jim Cook (male).  Description of State and Local Requirements of the local region of the local region of the local requirements of the local region	

## EEOC CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION Page 2 of 4 Linda Liano v. Computer Sciences Corporation

Throughout my fifteen (15) years of employment with Respondent, I was a loyal, dedicated, and hardworking employee. By way of example only, I was promoted several times within the company and was a part of the Senior Management Team. I successfully integrated an acquired company into Respondent's existing organization in a three month schedule. In addition, I routinely received bonuses, salary increases, and stock options grants.

#### 2. HARM SUMMARY

I have been discriminated against, including subjected to a hostile work environment, based on my age (59) and sex (female) and a combination of age and sex. I believe that Respondent has a pattern of practice of discriminating against women and/or older employees. Evidence of discriminatory conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- (a) My performance at all times has been excellent. By way of example, in my first fourteen (14) years with Respondent, I never received a poor performance review.
- (b) At the time of my termination, Mr. Roman had five (5) direct reports, including me. I was the oldest of Mr. Roman's direct reports and the only direct report who was terminated. Mr. Roman's direct reports were:
  - i. John Guda (male, 53);
  - ii. Nigel Whitehead (male, 52);
  - iii. Freddy Lykke (male)
  - iv. Jordan Battani (female, 53); and
  - v. Myself.
- (c) On December 12, 2012, Respondent terminated me, effective December 31, 2012.

U

5

- (d) The reason given for my termination was that Respondent had "engaged in a structural reorganization."
- (e) At the time of my termination, I believe that I was only employee out of the approximately seven hundred fifty (750) employees under Mr. Roman terminated as a result of this alleged reorganization.
- (f) After I was terminated, my job duties were distributed among the seven

### EEOC CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION Page 3 of 4 Linda Liano v. Computer Sciences Corporation

- individuals that had been reporting to me. Four (4) of these individuals are under the age of forty (40); three (3) of these individuals are men.
- (g) Prior to my termination and for the first time in my fifteen (15) year tenure with Respondent, I received a negative performance review.
- (h) This negative performance review was unjustified and unfounded.
- (i) Respondent had not provided me with any performance feedback during the performance period covered by the review, and the review document did not contain any specific details to support the negative evaluation.
- (j) Respondent did not offer me the opportunity to take a job with reduced scope and lower salary to support Respondent's cost reduction initiative.
- (k) After Mr. Roman became my supervisor, I felt that he failed to communicate with me. By way of example only, during the eight month period after Mr. Roman gave me a negative performance review, he either failed to attend, or cancelled twenty-one (21) of the thirty-seven (37) group or individual meetings scheduled with me.
- (I) In approximately August of 2012, Respondent held a strategic planning meeting. At that time there were six (6) employees reporting to Mr. Roman, four of whom were male. Respondent invited the three (3) of his male direct reports to attend this meeting in person. I was instructed to attend the meeting via telephone conference, yet was given no explanation as to why I was not invited to attend in person along with the other, male, invitees.
- (m) In communications to Mr. Pettiti, a male direct report of mine who was approximately twenty-eight (28) years of age, and later in his communications with me, Mr. Roman described me as "hot."
- (n) Mr. Roman invited Mr. Pettiti, to an executive level strategic planning meeting, but did not invite me to the same.
- (o) Respondent recruited and hand-picked Ben Pettiti (male, 28), an outside hire, to be a Project Manager directly reporting to me.
- (p) To the best of my knowledge, Respondent did not post for this role, nor did Respondent did consider internal female and/or older candidates that may have been more qualified for this role.
- (q) Respondent did not allow me the opportunity to interview Mr. Pettiti.

## EEOC CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION Page 4 of 4 Linda Liano v. Computer Sciences Corporation

- (r) Respondent's upper echelon of operational employees are predominantly male, demonstrating a pattern and practice of discriminatory hiring and personnel decisions which have a disparate impact that adversely affect women. By way of example only:
  - 1. The U.S. and U.K. Healthcare group, approximately fifty—six percent (56%) are male. For the top three highest job levels, seventy percent (70%) are male.
  - 2. All of the eleven (11) operational Executive Officers are male.
  - 3. Eight (8) out of the nine (9) members of the Board of Directors are male.

#### B. 1. Respondent's Stated Reasons

- a. Respondent's stated reason for my termination was that the company was reorganizing.
- b. Respondent's stated reason for my termination is pretextual. At the time of my termination, I was the only employee out of the approximately seven hundred fifty (750) employees under Mr. Roman who was terminated.
- c. Respondent has not offered me any further explanation for my termination.
- d. Respondent has not offered any reason for subjecting me to a hostile work environment.
- e. Respondent has not offered me any explanation for its pattern and practice of discriminating against female and/or older employees.

#### C. 1. Statutes and Basis for Allegation

I allege that Respondent has discriminated against me, including subjecting me to a hostile work environment, based on my sex (female) and age (59), and combination of sex and age, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §2000e, et seq. ("Title VII"), the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 621, et seq. ("ADEA") and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, as amended, 43 P.S. §951, et seq. ("PHRA").

# EXHIBIT B

EEOC Form 161-B (11/09)

#### U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

#### NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUEST)

То:	Linda Liano		
	Berwyn, PA 19312		

**Washington Field Office** From: 131 M Street, N.E. Suite 4NW02F Washington, DC 20507

	On behalf of person(s) aggrieved wh CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §1601.7(s	nose identity is		
EEOC Charg	e No.	EEOC Representative		Telephone No.
530-2013-		Danielle Hayot, Federal Investigator		(202) 419-0747
330-2013-	VATVI		(See also the additional information	enclosed with this form.)

NOTICE TO THE PERSON AGGRIEVED:

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), or the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act (GINA): This is your Notice of Right to Sue, Issued under Title VII, the ADA or GINA based on the above-numbered charge. It has been issued at your request. Your lawsuit under Title VII, the ADA or GINA must be filed in a federal or state court WITHIN 90 DAYS of your receipt of this notice; or your right to sue based on this charge will be lost. (The time limit for filing suit based on a claim under state law may be different.)

	·	
X	More than 180 days have passed since the filing of this charge.	
	Less than 180 days have passed since the filing of this charge, but I have be able to complete its administrative processing within 180 days from the	determined that it is unlikely that the EEOC will a filing of this charge.
X	The EEOC is terminating its processing of this charge.	
	The EEOC will continue to process this charge.	find the language filed to

Age Discrimination In Employment Act (ADEA): You may sue under the ADEA at any time from 60 days after the charge was filed until 90 days after you receive notice that we have completed action on the charge. In this regard, the paragraph marked below applies to your case:

The EEOC is closing your case. Therefore, your lawsuit under the ADEA must be filed in federal or state court WITHIN X 90 DAYS of your receipt of this Notice. Otherwise, your right to sue based on the above-numbered charge will be lost.

The EEOC is continuing its handling of your ADEA case. However, if 60 days have passed since the filing of the charge, you may file suit in federal or state court under the ADEA at this time.

Equal Pay Act (EPA): You already have the right to sue under the EPA (filling an EEOC charge is not required.) EPA suits must be brought in federal or state court within 2 years (3 years for willful violations) of the alleged EPA underpayment. This means that backpay due for any violations that occurred more than 2 years (3 years) before you file suit may not be collectible.

If you file suit, based on this charge, please send a copy of your court complaint to this office.

On behalf of the Commission

Mindy E. Weinstein,

(Date Mailed)

Enclosures(s)

杨K: Acting Director

CC:

Sunita Holzer **Human Resources Manager** COMPUTER SCIENCES CORPORATION 3170 Fairview Park Drive Falls Church, VA 22042

**Ashley Waring** CONSOLE LAW OFFICES 1525 Locust Street 9th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19102